

2014 WB Advisory Group Meeting  
March 21, 2013 6 pm – 9 pm  
Montesano Library

---

WDFW Staff: Steve Theisfeld, Ron Warren, Kirt Hughes, Mike Scharpf, Barbara McClellan, Chad Herring

Advisors: LeeRoy Wisner, Marlisa Dugan, Bob Muhlhauser, Steve Gray, Norm Reinhardt, Allan Hollingsworth, Steve Gacke, Andy Mitby, Lance Gray, Bob Lake, David Hollingsworth

---

Steve Theisfeld: Opening statements

SGacke: Meeting prior for pamphlet review?

ST: Let's schedule a meeting then: Monday, April 14 or Tuesday April 15? Doodle poll everyone.

**Drop out/off mortality: Handout for Puget Sound**

ST: spent two days modifying the model to include drop out & drop off rates. We will include it this year but we have not gone back to adjust run sizes. It's a compromise to add the mortality.

- Chinook: Comm net – 3% Rec – 5%

AH: have you taken into consideration the length of the set?

ST: No. we just used these tribal/state accepted rates

AM: 3% is wrong based on what we encounter. We encounter 18%.

ST: applies to the wild rate for wild encounters

KH: encounter rate gets applied to encounters not to mark rate. Can put together a diagram for the math.

LG: Puget Sound has 5 hour drifts and you are going to use the same rate.

ST: we acknowledge that there are differences. Trying to make the estimate of mortality as accurate as possible.

SGray: Use data that is pertinent to what we actually do and how we fish. That's only fair.

AM: Do you believe that the drop-out rate is the same as PS?

ST: There is mortality that is not accounted for on both sides. These rates account for all other mortality like drop-out or pinneped. In lieu of doing an actual study in WB, these are the rates we've decided to use. This amount tried to account for some of it.

SGray: It doesn't seem fair to apply a drop-out rate for one fishery to another fishery.

ST: I can pass that along that we can use observer data but for right now these are the rates we will use.

SGray: How do we get the info/data that the scientists have used to get these rates? I would like to get that data.

BL: I would like that same data and the notes that accompany those data. Net size.

ST: This is either done at the PFM or CTC process

LG: Wouldn't it make sense to look into how those data were decided upon before we use them?

**Release Mortality Rates: IFSP Handout**

ST: agency settled out of court and the agreement was that we would review these rates

- rates are higher
- Final report on March 26
- Will be looking at chum and potentially coho

BL: I disagree with those rates especially based on the observer data. Why not tag some fish while we are on-board?

ST: that's a good recommendation to tag fish

NR: Did the dept pick those panelist based on merit, experts in their field?

ST: Yes

AH: Is the Dept. going to do a long- term mortality for recreational fishing?

ST: Can't say we will do a study in the next few years within each harbor

MD: Would like to help with publicity to get more CRC returns

ST: We can't charge for a license unless we have legislature approval.

NR: Petition the Legislature to do online reporting the same way we do for PS Crab, which is bi-annually, or create fine.

SGray: Creel checkers should have the ability to look at the CRC card or look on-board. Access to sport data is archaic compared to the commercial fishery.

### **2014 WB Management Objectives: Handout**

LG: I told you that you won't have those fish return to Naselle so you will take it out of our fishery. You said you don't know what the number of natural fish and you would adapt to that number.

KH: Trying to achieve no more than 30% for Naselle

LG: you keep putting thousands of fish above the weir and you said you would get a better return but you aren't getting those back.

SGacke: You are proposing to only putting 500 Chinook above weir. We have been putting around 2500 fish above. If we aren't making escapement, how are you going to get to the goal?

ST: We have been putting so many fish above that we are on the down side of the curve.

SGray: By decreasing the number of hatchery fish, the natural component that spawns has decreased. This plan has been a failure. We told you that type of river won't sustain that kind of natural population.

LG: How can you have an integrated system when you don't have enough natural fish now to integrate?

RW: We knew there would be some reduction in what goes upstream but we figured that would rebound at some point.

LG: What have we come here to talk about? There doesn't seem to be a discussion here. You are just telling us what you are going to do. We told you this plan would not work in the Naselle.

SGacke: There is a lot of info and we should have had this before today so we had time to review it to comment. What's the plan now?

ST: We should be at 500K now.

LG: I want to see the document that states we are mandated to designate a natural stock in Naselle. We haven't even gone through a full cycle yet.

RW: The document is 21<sup>st</sup> Century Salmon and Steelhead. It states how to go about getting that.

SGacke: Is there a document that says we will not surplus any Chinook on Naselle?

RW: Agreement was not to sell to buyer so they would go back to river (food bank or nutrient enhance)

BL: Why are we trying to start a wild run when it's not there?

SGray: Chum – mostly males early in October. Most females show up from Oct 20 – Nov 1.

SGacke: Not showing any objectives for late coho.

ST: its wrapped up in the coho goal

SGray: Should be separate

### **Naselle & Nemah Petitions:**

Naselle Petition: open from Hwy 4 to just below the hatchery at Aug. 1

- Commission kicked it NOF process
- Will bring both up at public meeting

- BL: If you are having an issue with wild Chinook on Naselle, how can you open for a Chinook fishery on Aug. 1? Recommend not to open this.
- SGacke: Seemed odd that there are names on the petition that weren't in favor of this last year. 16 people on the petition never saw anything in writing when signing this petition. This raised concerns. I contacted the AG office to ask what the rules are. There are no criteria but the agency should take that into consideration. 76% of the landowners do not support this petition. Opposed to this.
- SGray: **Close the entire Naselle to protect those fish especially if you are closing the commercial fishery in that area for protection.**
- MD: I support Gacke in opposing this petition. Look at Nemah and Naselle independently.
- NR: **If we are not making escapement then do not open that fishery**
- Group does not support any opening in Naselle petition

#### Nemah Petition:

- 17 parcels from bridge closure to hatchery owned by 11 people.
- All are supportive to opening that part of the river. Not sure they are all open to letting fishers through their property for access but some certainly will
- The lower portion of the river that has chinook retention is successful
- I'm interested in both chinook but especially for late coho
- Doesn't seem to be a recommendation from the Advisory Group for the public meeting next week

#### Modeling:

- Based on achieving the 20% on Naselle, to maximize coho the start of the commercial fishery doesn't begin until Sept 2-8.
- Dip in fishery (previous to Aug 15) – could pull together same rates to get time
- AM: 2U shouldn't have impacts to Naselle
- KH: will look at tag data again
- Looks like 14 Naselle wild chinook per 10<sup>th</sup> percent.

ST: North Bay closure has the same closure as the commercial fleet

Commercial fishers: just close above the bridges in North River and Smith Creek. No one fishes in the small area North Bay

AM: So we moved chinook to Nemah so we could harvest those and now you are us we can't catch them. Then entire Nemah Chinook run has gone by by the time you get this opened.

AM: knowing what we know now and we aren't catching the Chinook that you are raising, are we going to raise more coho instead because there is no point in raising them?

ST: I will take that up the chain.

NR: this new 20%, is this an interim rate? The Commission said it will look at a policy for WB for 2015. If these are the objectives for this year, Is the Dept going to be looking at Chinook production if these fish cannot be utilized and come back as excess/surplus? We are probably looking at a reduction in Chinook production in WB.

ST: I would think so.

BL: Does the Commission know about the reduction from 30% to 20%?

ST: Do not know

SGacke: Do you know what you are going to propose any changes to the Naselle recreational fisheries from Hwy 4 downstream?

ST: given the argument to protect natural chinook in Naselle below the hatchery, I haven't heard any proposals to that.

LG: What's the hooking mortality for the recreational fishery?

ST: 10%

### **Public Testimony:**

Greg McMillian

- The new mortality rate was not impartial since we didn't get a say
- Why are we raising chinook if we do not have them to harvest. Let's just raise coho.

Bob Muhlhauser

- **Net free area north area of bay through Sept. 15**
- Sept. 15 – Oct 1:
- **North River – 3 coho retention total regardless of mark status**

Bob Lake

- Panelist on IFSP not credible and are biased. Opposed to mortality rates
- **Opposed to a closure at the top of the bay suggested through Sept. 15**
- **Would like a 2N openings for Nemah fish**

Steve Gacke

- **Naselle late coho – after Nov 15: 3 adults, 2 wild coho**
- Concern for November commercial fishery – **would like to consider with commercial fishers some option for Nov**
- **Increase in the brood release for late coho for total WB**

Steve Gray

- WB Plan doesn't work. Fisheries are disappearing based on what this plan has done.